



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,575	04/01/2004	Gregory E. Borchers	SLA1461	1234
52894	7590	12/10/2008		
KRIEGER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, INC.				
PO Box 872438				
Vancouver, WA 98687-2438				
EXAMINER				
WANG, JUE S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,575

Applicant(s)

BORCHERS, GREGORY E.

Examiner

JUE S. WANG

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 17-26 have been examined.
2. Claims 1-16 were cancelled in amendment dated 3/7/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 18-21 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following lacks antecedent basis in the claims:

- i. Claim 18, line 1, claim 19, line 1, claim 20, line 1, "A method as described in claim 0". It is believed that claims 18, 19, and 20 were intended to depend on claim 17 and it is treated as such for compact prosecution of the claims.
- ii. Claim 23, line 1, claim 24, line 1, claim 25, line 1, recite "A system as described in claim 21", whereas claim 21 is a method claim and does not recite a system. Because of the recitation of a system in claim 22, it is believed that claims 23, 24, and 25 were intended to depend on claim 22 and it is treated as such for compact prosecution of the claims.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guess (US 2003/0204711 A1), in view of McGowan et al. (US 2005/0028165 A1, hereinafter McGowan).

7. As per claim 17, Guess teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for preserving configuration data during firmware modification (see [0042], [0044]), said method comprising:

- a) establishing a direct serial connection between a firmware device and a download computing device (see [0045]);
- c) uploading firmware configuration data, from an existing firmware structure in said firmware device to the download computing device (see [0046]);
- d) storing said firmware configuration data on the download computing device (see [0046]);
- e) erasing firmware, including said firmware configuration data, from said firmware device (see Fig 3, [0021], [0047]);
- f) loading a new firmware structure from said download computing device to said firmware device over said direct serial connection (see [0047]);

g) loading said firmware configuration data from the download computing device to said firmware device over said serial connection (see [0050]).

Guess does not teach a web-based data management utility residing on a server, a network connection connecting said firmware device, said download computing device, and said web-based management utility. Guess also does not teach uploading and storing firmware configuration data over the network connection, from an existing firmware structure in said firmware device to the web server using web-based administration utility, wherein said web-based administration utility performs said uploading by pulling data from said existing firmware structure without loading any software onto said firmware device, and loading the firmware configuration data from the web server to the firmware device over the network connection.

McGowan teaches a web-based data management utility residing on a server (see Fig 1, Fig 2, [0029], [0031]), a network connection connecting a computing device and said web-based management utility (see Fig 1, Fig 2, [0025], [0029], [0031]) and uploading configuration data from the computing device to the web server using the web-based administration utility, wherein said web-based administration utility performs said uploading by pulling data from said existing firmware structure without loading any software onto said firmware device, and loading the configuration data from the web server to the computing device (see [0007], [0029], [0040], [0041]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Guess to contain a web-based data management utility residing on a server, a network connection connecting said firmware device, and said web-based management utility, and uploading configuration data from the firmware device to the web

server using the web-based administration utility, wherein said web-based administration utility performs said uploading by pulling data from said existing firmware structure without loading any software onto said firmware device, and loading the configuration data from the web server to the firmware device as taught by McGowan because the server system allows a copy of the latest configuration of the enterprise application to be maintained so that the user's settings can be restored (see [0007] and [0040] of McGowan).

8. As per claim 19 (as currently dependent on claim 17), Guess teaches modifying the configuration data prior to said loading said configuration data (see [0049]-[0051]).

Guess does not teach the modifying is performed with the web server.

McGowan teaches that the web-based administration utility on the web server performs modification of configuration data (i.e., the server will reconcile the new updated properties file with the reconciled properties files in server database prior to push down, see [0041]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Guess to use the web-based administration utility to perform the modification as taught by McGowan to allow the device receiving the configuration file to contain an up-to-date, cumulative configuration of the application (see [0041] of McGowan).

9. As per claim 21, Guess does not teach combining said additional configuration data with said configuration data using said web-based device administration utility on said web server prior to said loading said firmware configuration data.

McGowan teaches that the web-based device administration utility on the web server combines additional configuration data with old configuration data prior to loading the configuration data (i.e., the server will reconcile the new updated properties file with the reconciled properties files in server database prior to push down, see [0041]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Guess to combine said additional configuration data with said configuration data using said web-based device administration utility on said web server prior to said loading said firmware configuration data as taught by McGowan to allow the device receiving the configuration file to contain an up-to-date, cumulative configuration of the application (see [0041] of McGowan).

10. As per claims 22, 24, and 26, these are system claims with limitations that are substantially similar to claims 17, 19, and 21. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 17, 19, and 21.

11. Claims 18, 20, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guess (US 2003/0204711 A1), in view of McGowan et al. (US 2005/0028165 A1, hereinafter McGowan), as applied to claims 17 and 22 above, further in view of Woodward et al. (US 2002/0104080 A1, hereinafter Woodward).

12. As per claim 18 (as currently dependent on claim 17), Guess teaches converting said configuration data to a format compatible with said new firmware structure prior to loading said firmware configuration data (see [0049]-[0051]).

Guess and McGowan do not teach that the conversion is performed by the web-based device administration utility on the web server.

Woodward teaches that the web-based administration utility on the web server performs conversion of configuration data (see [0052], [0053]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Guess to use the web-based administration utility to perform the conversion as taught by Woodward because the server system can be periodically updated to accommodate new and different systems, and formats (see [0013] of Woodward).

13. As per claim 20 (as currently dependent on claim 17), Guess and McGowan do not teach querying network elements to ascertain additional configuration data needed by said new firmware structure.

Woodward teaches computer devices querying network elements to ascertain additional configuration data needed by new applications on the computer device (see [0012], [0053], [0235]-[0237]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Guess and McGowan to query network elements to ascertain additional configuration data needed by said new firmware structure as taught by Woodward because the server system allows the configuration data to be updated to reflect changes in

software or to work with new and different systems, platforms, formats and programs (see [0012], [0013] of Woodward).

14. As per claims 23 and 25, these are system claims with limitations that are substantially similar to claims 18 and 20. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 18 and 20.

Response to Arguments

15. Rejection of claims under §103(a):

16. As per independent claims 17 and 22, Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Chefalas et al. (US 2005/0144617 A1) is cited to teach a system of recording user settings for recovery or new system creation.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jue S. Wang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Jue Wang
Examiner
Art Unit 2193